

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **35 USC §103(a)**

In the instant Office Action, independent claim 6 and dependent claims 4 and 5 are rejected under §102(e) over Haldorsen (US 6,749,294). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Haldorsen teaches only that ink jet print cartridges are provided with keying features so as to prevent foreign print cartridges from being used with the printer. The printer includes a chute for receiving acceptable ink jet print cartridges, and a member for sliding fully laterally across the keying features of acceptable ink jet print cartridges. Haldorsen does not teach that the chute and/or the member of one printer are replaceable or interchangeable with other chutes/members.

From the description of Haldorsen, in particular at col. 12, lines 30- 40, a single chute/member is used for **all** acceptable print cartridges. There is no teaching or suggestion of a first set of acceptable print cartridges which fit a first chute/member, and a second set of equally acceptable print cartridges which fit a second chute/member. According to the disclosure of Haldorsen, print cartridges are either acceptable and will therefore fit the sole chute/member, or unacceptable and therefore will not fit.

Applicant concedes that Haldorsen does describe a foreign print cartridge that has keying features, but which keying features do not fit the chute/member (col. 12, lines 35 – 40). Applicant understands that such a description does suggest that there would hence exist another chute/member that could properly receive this foreign print cartridge. However, there is no mention whatsoever that this other chute/member could be interchanged with the existing chute/member so that the printer can then receive the foreign print cartridge. In fact, the use of the term “foreign” in describing the foreign print cartridge fairly suggest that it is the intention of Haldorsen that the printer never be able to accept/receive such print cartridges.

Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear from Haldorsen that the printer described therein was designed to use only one chute/member, and that this chute/member was designed to received all acceptable/non-foreign print cartridges but exclude all foreign print cartridges. The printer of Haldorsen was not designed to interchange chutes/members so that the printer could also use foreign print cartridges. It is fairly suggested from the description of Haldorsen that should it be desired to use cartridges which are not keyed for the current chute/member, that an entirely different printer with a different chute/member be used. There is no suggestion that the existing cradle of the printer be interchanged.

Claim 1 recites a system comprising a printer having a first cradle. The system must therefore have a printer in which the first cradle is provided. A system comprising a printer in which no cradle has yet been provided is not the same system. Claim 1 goes on to recite a second cradle that is interchangeable with the first cradle. By this recitation, it is clear that the first cradle can be removed from the printer and the second cradle inserted into the same printer, as opposed to another printer. Applicant submits that a novel and inventive feature of claim 1 lies in the fact that one printer originally has a first cradle, but can later interchange this first cradle for a second cradle.

Applicant further submits that it would be inappropriate to construe claim 1 as directed to a printer in which no cradle has yet been installed, but which printer can be installed with any one of a plurality of available cradles. Claim 1 explicitly recites the presence of the first cradle in the printer, and the removal of this first cradle so that a second cradle is interchanged therewith.

Haldorsen, in merely suggesting that different cartridge/cradle combinations exists, does not teach or suggest that the chute/member of one printer is interchangeable. The fact that different cartridge/cradle combinations exist does not necessitate the interchangeability of cradles within one printer. Rather, this fact merely suggest that different printers are provided with different non-interchangeable cradles. The issue at hand is whether a printer originally having a first cradle can have this first cradle interchanged with a second, different, cradle. The disclosure of Haldorsen is at best silent as to this issue, and provides no resolution. Accordingly, it cannot be said that Haldorsen teaches or suggests the invention of claim 1.

The Examiner's further consideration of the application is earnestly sought.

Very respectfully,



---

Kia Silverbrook, Managing Director

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: pair@silverbrookresearch.com  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762